



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TEXTUAL NOTES ON PHAEDRUS

BY J. P. POSTGATE

As this paper will deal in large measure with the evidence for the text of Phaedrus which is supplied by his mediaeval paraphrasts, it will be as well to indicate at the outset the limits within which that evidence can be used. Of its utility if employed with discernment there can now be no question. M. Havet's restorations of the reading at *App. 26. 1 lupus* for *lepus* and of the order of verses in *iii. 7. 11 ff.*, 21–24 to follow 10, are instances in point.

Without traversing anew all the ground over which my predecessors have traveled I would refer to some cardinal points. In the first place a fable may be both in Phaedrus and a paraphrast and yet the paraphrast have not taken it from the fabulist. A good example is *App. 13*, the "Widow and the Soldier," with which the narrative in *Romulus iii. 9* (Hervieux, *les fabulistes Latins*, II, 217) has only its subject in common. Secondly, in fables where Phaedrus was the original source, besides the involuntary alterations which must occur when a mediaeval Latinist is turning the verse of a classical writer into prose, there may be deviations and accretions due to the paraphrast himself. I imagine for example that no one will attribute to Phaedrus the insipid pendant to the catalogue of birds' characteristics that we find in the Wissemburg collection (Hervieux, *op. cit.*, p. 188) and *Romulus iv. 4*, though in other lines these show a great deal of verbal resemblance to the Phaedrus fable *iii. 18*. Phaedrus had written, 10 ff.: "Fatorum arbitrio partes sunt uobis datae; / Tibi forma, uires aquilae, luscinio melos, / augurium coruo, laeua cornici omina." What we find in *Romulus* is "Tibi nitor et color et forma, maior uirtus aquilae, lusciniae cantus uocis, auguria sumit coruus," then "grunnire accepit columba, dolet ritus [manifestly corrupt], gruis ostendit semper tempus et in oliva parit turdus; ficitula [for "ficedula"] probanda pomis, lucifero gaudet hirundo, nudus sero uolat uespertilio, gallus nouit noctis horas," in which the mediaeval stamp is unmistakable. With these cautions in mind we shall be able to use with profit the evidence of versions often so close to their

original that we can without appreciable effort transform their prose into the actual iambics of Phaedrus.¹

One of the chief uses of these paraphrases is that they help us now and again to track glosses or adscripts which have ousted the genuine reading from the manuscripts and from our text. A simple instance is i. 2. 27 ff.:

Furtim igitur dant Mercurio mandata ad Jovem,
adflictis ut succurrat. Tunc contra deus;
“quia noluitis vestrum ferre, ‘inquit,’ bonum,
malum perferte.”

deus would have eluded observation but for the indications of the paraphrasts. Ademar (Hervieux, p. 139), who is closest of all to Phaedrus here (for ver. 26 he has “fugitant inertes uocesque praeculdit metus,” only putting *uocesque* for the fabulist’s *uocem*), gives “furtim mittunt per Mercurium mandata Ioui ut desistat. E contra *Iupiter*: quia noluitis ferre bonum ut feratis malum hunc sustinete malum,” etc. Wissemburg (*ibid.*, p. 176) has “tunc rogare coeperunt: succurre, *Iupiter*, morimur: et contra altitonans: quia noluitis bonum sufferre, sustinete malum,” and Romulus who has amplified and embroidered considerably gives (ii. 1) “tunc uoces cum lacrimis ad sydera tollunt: succurre, *Iuppiter*, morimur. E contra illis altitonans,” etc. The three candidates for the place of honor in Phaedrus’ sentence, *deus*, *Iuppiter*, *altitonans*, disappear directly we see what is behind, the equivalent and metrical *Tonans*.

A parallel intrusion into the traditional text may be detected in i. 21. 3 ff.:

defectus annis et desertus uiribus
leo cum iaceret spiritum extremum trahens,
aper fulmineis uenit ad eum dentibus
et uindicauit ictu ueterem iniuriam.

Our suspicions are aroused by the circumstance that P (the Pithoceanus) has *ad eum uenit*, but D (the scheda Petri Danielis) *uenit ad eum*. Of the paraphrasts, Ademar (p. 136) has “super fulmineis *uenit ad eum* aper et dentibus se uindicauit, ictu ueteres iniurias infestans,” etc., Wissemburg (p. 169), “aper *ad eum uenit* iracundus

¹ This is especially true of the *Fabulae Antiquae* of Ademar, Hervieux, *op. cit.*, pp. 131 ff.

spumans fulmineis dentibus et uindicauit ictum ueterem," Romulus (p. 201), "aper *ad eum uenit* iratus *spumans fulmineis dentibus et uindicauit ictum ueterem*."

Can we doubt what this means, viz., that in the ultimate source of all our authorities the line appeared in this form:

ad eum
aper fulmineis *spumans uenit* dentibus,

and that the vigorous *spumans* (of which Ademar's *super* is a corruption) should replace the useless *ad eum* of the Vulgate? Compare the close parallel in Martial, a reader of Phaedrus as we know, "*fulmineo spumantis apri sum dente peremptus*" (xi. 69. 9). *Spumans* or *spumeus* is in fact almost a standing epithet of *aper* (Vergil, Juvenal, Martial, Claudian). Cf. also Sen. *Dial.* iii. 1. 6, "*spumant apris ora, dentes acuuntur attritu.*"

In i. 27. 4, a passage already corrected in part by M. Havet, a similar confrontation of our authorities will lead us to the truth:

uulpes ad cenam dicitur ciconiam
prior inuitasse et illi liquidam in patena
posuisse sorbitionem.

The variations of the paraphrasts are as follows: Ademar (p. 154), "posuit *illi* in *scutella* *sorbitiunculam*," Wissemburg (p. 166), "coctas *sorbitiunculas* in *marmore* [corrected to -a] *fudit*," Romulus (p. 209), "posuit *illi* in *catino* *sorbitionem liquidam*." The Greek version as we find it in Plutarch *Qu. Conu.* i. 614 E F is nearest to the Wissemburg paraphrase, *οἱ δὲ τοιαῦτα προβλήματα καθιέντες οὐδὲν ἀν τῆς Αἰσωπείου γεράνου καὶ ἀλώπεκος ἐπιεικέστεροι πρὸς κοινωνίαν φανεῖεν ὅν η μὲν ἔτνος τι λιπαρὸν κατὰ λίθου πλατείας καταχεαμένη τὴν γέρανον ἐδέξατο οὐκ εὐώχουμένη, ἀλλὰ γελοῖα πάσχουσαν.* Not only has *marmore* this, presumably independent, confirmation, but it is supported by the discrepancy in the words used of the vessel by the other authorities, *patina*, *scutella*, *catinus*, which shows that this was not named but described. Accordingly M. Havet, who has also some very just remarks on the unmetrical character of the Vulgate reading in *patina liquidam*, has rightly restored *in marmore* to the text. But he has not done so well in building upon *illi*, for which he substitutes *lēui* in the sense of *πλατείας*, a meaning it does not possess.

Illi has no more claim to respect than *ad eum* in the passage last discussed. *Ponere* without a dative is common enough of “serving up,” “putting on table”; Pers. i. 53, Mart. iv. 69. 2 may serve as examples. And the word we want to represent *πλατέιας* is *patulo*: cf. Verg. Aen. vii. 115, “*patulis . . . quadris*,” Juv. 3. 277, “*patulas . . . pelues*”; cf. Varro *L. L.* v. 120, “*patenas a patulo dixerunt*.” Phaedrus uses *patulus* for *capacious*, App. 23. 2.

i. 5.6: sic est locutus partibus factis leo:

ego primam tollo, *nominor quoniam leo*;
secundam, quia sum fortis, tribuetis mihi;
tum, quia plus ualeo, me sequetur tertia;
malo adficietur, si quis quartam tetigerit.

That *rex* should stand somewhere in the second line seems as certain as that *fortis* in the third should be changed to *socius*, *Withof*, or *consors*, *Gow*. After M. Havet’s discussion in his *Critical Disquisition* (ed. pp. 187 f.), it is superfluous for me to argue this point. It would seem moreover that it could only have stood by the side of *quia* in the last foot but one. This leaves us *nominor* and *leo* to deal with—suspicious both of them. The first I had already condemned and conjectured that it concealed *nomine* before I read the note of Bentley in which *nomine hoc* “on this account” is proposed. But *leo* which Bentley kept (*quia sum leo*) is not less objectionable and even more suspicious, as just above it stands another *leo*. And yet it hardly hides the truth. *Cluo*, another form of *clueo*, “am called,” is the lightest of changes and will at once account for the appearance of *nominor* in the place of *nomine hoc*, ‘cluet, *nominatur*’ (Nonius 87. 28). The word was archaic in the time of Phaedrus and was used here as in Seneca’s *jeu d’esprit* on the emperor Claudius 7 “exprome propere sede qua genitus cluas,” to ridicule the pretensions of a monarch. I may add that it escapes the objection which Bentley brings against *nominor* “non eo ceteris feris excellit quod *nominetur* sed quod sit *leo*.” For *cluere* often hardly differs from *esse*, as, e.g., in Lucretius. For the sake of euphony we must arrange the words thus,

ego primam tollo, *nomine hoc rex quia cluo*.

Before leaving the passage I may note that we can see from the paraphrasts that an early (corrupt) variant for *ualeo* was *uelox*.

- i. 6.1: Viciinis furis celebres uidit nuptias
 Aesopus et continuo narrare incipit:
 uxorem quondam Sol cum uellet ducere,
 clamorem ranae sustulere ad sidera.

The indications of the paraphrasts point to the *viciniis* which M. Havet has restored for *uicini*; for *f* might easily fall out before *s*. But there are signs also, as indeed he suggests, of a lacuna, the paraphrasts agreeing in adding *interueniens* (Wissemburg) or its equivalent *cum interuenisset* (Romulus), (*interuenit dicens*, Ademar), in addition to which *narrare* seems to desire an object.

Perhaps we should add after 2,

conuiuis interueniens talem fabulam.

For *talem fabulam* compare *talem fabellam* (i. 2. 9).

The beginning of Aesop's speech to the wedding guests also appears to have been lost, for Ademar (p. 134) has "Audite gaudia uestra" and Romulus (p. 198) "'audite' inquit 'gaudia uestra,'" which seems to be a curt abbreviation of "uos uestra quae sint audiatis gaudia."

- i. 31. 3 ff.: columbae saepe cum fugissent miluum
 et celeritate pennae uitassent necem.

As M. Havet follows Bentley in changing *fugissent* to the compound *ecfugissent*, and as both Heinsius and Bentley altered *uitassent* to *euitassent*, it does not seem superfluous to observe that neither change is necessary. *Vitassent* can express the sense required, as Horace's "uitaui denique culpam / non laudem merui," *A. P.* 267, is enough to show; and the line thus gives the meaning of *effugissent*. *Fugissent* marks a prior stage "fled from," as in Ovid *Metamorphoses* i. 506, "sic aquilam penna fugiunt trepidante columbae / hostes quaeque suos."

At the end of this poem the indications of the paraphrasts show a line has been lost as M. Havet rightly argues. His suggestion that after

tunc de reliquiis una "merito plectimur"

we should add

huic spiritum praedoni quae commisimus

is based on Wissemburg (p. 176), "sed digne et bene patimur qui nos predoni commisimus" (cf. Romulus p. 205, "sed digne hec patimur

que nos tali commisimus”), but he has taken *spiritum* from Ademar (p. 139), “sic merito agitur qui nostrum spiritum tali credidimus inimico.” But in this fable Ademar follows Phaedrus much more closely than Wissemburg and Romulus, who in fact introduce a third actor in the Hawk whom the *columbae* choose as king. I agree therefore with Riese in basing the supplement on his paraphrase and proposing

nostrum hosti tali quae credidimus spiritum.

For *hostis* in a similar connection besides the passage of Ovid quoted above see Phaedrus i. 28. 10; iv. 2. 18, “hostis callidi.” The occurrence of *credentes* in 10 is no objection to *credidimus* here but rather an argument in its favor.

iii. 8. 9 f.: ergo ad patrem decurrit laesura inuicem
magnaue inuidia criminatur *filium*.

filium has naturally been questioned, as it offends against the rule of Latin usage by which these words of relationship are referred to the immediate subject. For contraventions of the rule there appears to be always some special reason, as in Lucan ix. 134 f. Sextus Pompey is allowed to say “nec credens Pharium tantum potuisse tyrannum litore Niliaco *socerum* iam stare putaui,” because *socer* and *gener* of Caesar and Pompey had practically passed into proper names. But none can be discerned here. Why M. Chauvin’s *futilem* has been admitted into M. Havet’s text I do not know. Beyond a superficial resemblance to *filium* it has nothing to recommend it; *bellulum*, M. Havet’s own suggestion, is somewhat better. But we want a substantive, not an adjective, and so *trossulum*, another conjecture of his, is on the right track, though in itself quite improbable. I propose *pupulum*, a diminutive of *pupum*, which I take from Catullus 56. 5 where it is conjoined with *puella*. Lipography is a recognized cause of corruption in the text of Phaedrus, e.g., i. 1. 7, *quereris*; iii. 7. 3, *occucurrit*. If *pupulum* became *pulum*, any scribe could make it into *filium*, which he had a few lines above.

iv. 18 (19). 24 f.: canes confusi subito quod fuerat fragor
repente *odorem mixto* cum merdis cacant.

The editors and critics who have altered *mixto* appear to have attacked the wrong word. We should simply remove the *m* from

odorem and take *cacant* in its absolute use. According to the Thesaurus this is the only passage where the verb has an accusative in this sense.

I take this opportunity of saying a word in defense of my conjecture in v. 17 of this fable accepted by Dr. Gow for the *Corpus Poetarum* text.

The Commonwealth of Dogs, learning of the misbehavior of their ambassadors and

timentes, rursus *aliquid ne simile accidat,*
odore canibus anum sed multo replent.

The *aliquid simile* should be mentioned in the previous line, but that contains nothing about it in the form we have it in the MSS:

rumor legatos superiores prodidit.

There too there has been lipography, *cacatus*; also confusion of c(C) and g(G). Cf. prol. 8 *fugatae* the MSS, *fucatae* Gronovius. The resulting *gatus* was readily tinkered up into *legatos*, the word which the context suggested. The verbal *cacatus* is not found elsewhere, but for the plural, cf. "ad meos haustus" (i. 1. 8).

iv Epilogus (v. 5): Adhuc supersunt multa quae possim loqui
et copiosa abundat rerum uarietas;
sed temperatae suaues sunt argutiae,
immodicæ offendunt. quare, uir sanctissime,
Particulo, chartis nomen uicturum meis,
Latinis dum manebit pretium litteris,
si non ingenium, certe breuitatem adproba,
quae commendari tanto debet iustius
quanto poetae sunt molesti ualidius.

The text of this little piece is with the exception of a single word at last correct. But that one corruption stultifies it completely. Phaedrus, commanding brevity and promising Particulo immortality from compositions which possess the quality he commends, winds up by saying that this brevity is laudable in the same proportion as *poets* are a nuisance. For the intolerable *poetae* Nauck proposed *loquaces*; but this leaves the tradition unexplained. It is not difficult to find the word which has been ousted from the text by its stupid explanation. To go on saying the same thing, to "harp" on the same thing is *cantare*, e.g., Plaut. *Trin.* 289, "haec dies noctesque tibi *canto*

ut caueas," the vain repetition is *cantilena*, Cic. *De or.* i. 105, "qui non Graeci alieuius cotidianam *loquacitatem* sine usu neque ex scholis *cantilenam* requirunt," and the tiresome iterator is *cantor*, as in Plautus *Pseud.* 366 "*cantores probos!*" (*qui eadem semper clamant*, the *Thesaurus*).

Appendix 14. 6 f. quos ultra paulo uilla *splendidi diuitis*
erat acceptura uirginem e matris sinu.

M. Havet makes a fair point against *ditis splendida*, Bothe's conjecture (accepted in the *Corpus*), when he says that a house cannot be "per se *splendida* nisi propter marmor uel citreas in foribus fascias," but his own *sponsi diuitis*, which he thinks produced *splendidi diuitis* through doubling of the *di*, has little likelihood. It has not, I think, been observed that it is quite needless to say to whom the *uilla* belonged; anyone would assume that it was that of the rich suitor. I propose *splendens ditiis*. *Ditiae*, a shorter equivalent of *diuitiae* to which it is usually corrupted, is found in Plautus and Terence (*Haut.* 194). *Splendens ditiis* is like Catullus' "tota *domus* gaudet regali *splendida gaza*," (64. 46) or Vergil's "at *domus* interior regali *splendida luxu instruitur*" (*Aen.* i. 637). I imagine that *splendens* became *splendida* and was then assimilated to *diuit(i)is*; but there may have been lipography as M. Havet thinks. Ovid (*Fasti* iv. 136) uses *diuitiae* in a similar way, of the costly ornaments on the statue of a goddess.

App. 17. Prementer partu scrofa cum gemeret iacens,
 accurrerit lupus et obstetricis partibus
 se posse fungi dixit, promittens opem.
 suspectum officium repudiauit malefici
 et "satis est" inquit "si recedis longius."

After this line, for which Wissemburg (p. 180) has "expono, frater, fetum, inquit, secura si tu recesseris" and Romulus (p. 206) exactly the same words though in a slightly different order, Wissemburg proceeds "obsecro ut des mihi honorem: et tu olim matrem habuisti" (these five words in the margin) "ille autem ut recessit statim profudit sarcinam" and Romulus "obsecro da mihi honorem. fuit etiam et tibi mater. ille autem ut recessit, frustra petendo fraudulenter fatigatus ipsa statim profudit sarcinam."

These additions indicate that in their common source stood two more lines which may be thus restored:

honorem mihi des: et tibi mater fuit.
ille ut recessit, sarcinam effudit statim.

For *sarcinam effundere*, which is Phaedrus' phrase, see iii. 15. 6. Whether this less abrupt dismissal of the Wolf is from the hand of Phaedrus or an early imitator it is not altogether easy to say. *Honorem dare* is not a very satisfactory phrase here, but the second line seems unexceptionable.

App. 24. Odiosa cornix super ouem consederat:
quam dorso cum tulisset *inuita* et diu
e. c.

It is true that adjectives and adverbs are sometimes coupled in Latin; but I think few will dispute that the *et* here adds nothing but inconcinnity to the normal expression “*quam cum inuita diu dorso tulisset.*” Now *inuitus* is one of the “epithets” most commonly transferred in Latin poetry when a part of the body is in question. So *inuita manu* (Ovid *Pont.* i. 2. 126); *inuita dextra* (Lucan i. 378); *inuitis pedibus* (Prop. ii. 25. 20); *inuito collo* (Ovid *Met.* ix. 606). And here Phaedrus should have written *inuito*. When I had hit upon this correction I learned from M. Havet in § 60 of his critical disquisition, p. 192, that this intruding *et* involves an elision to which there is no other parallel in Phaedrus—an independent and welcome confirmation.

App. 26: cum uenatorem celeri pede fugeret lupus.

M. Havet seems to be right in contending that *celeri pede* must refer to the man and not to the wolf and that the *cum persecutorem fugeret* of Ademar (p. 149) and the *cum persecutionem fugeret* of Romulus (p. 224) cast doubt on the genuineness of *uenatorem*. His correction “*cum celeri urgente pede uirum fugeret lupus*” provides *celeri pede* with the necessary participle, but is not otherwise felicitous. No noun is required, as it is a common practice of silver Latin to use participles in the Greek manner for relative clauses. So Phaedrus himself ii. 7. 10 *spoliatus*, “the one who had been stripped”; v. 1. 7, “*resides et sequentes otium*”= *qui otium sequebantur*. The paraphrases point to *persequentem*. *Feras persequi* is found in Ovid. But

as a piece of Latin writing I should prefer *se sequentem*. The *se*, to which there is no objection on the ground of euphony, might easily fall out before *sequentem* and *persequentem* would seem an obvious amendment.

In 1. 9 of the same piece

uenit sed abiit hac ad laeuam; et dexteram
demonstrat *nutu* partem.

I conjectured and Dr. Gow accepted the conjecture for the second edition of the *Corpus* that for *nutu* we should read *nictu*. This is confirmed not only by the *oculis* of 1. 10, but by the "adsignat *oculis*" of both Ademar and Romulus here.

App. 27. At the end of this ironical composition in which the mutual insincerities of a pair of lovers are transfixed the paraphrasts have an addition which seems to have a basis in the lost original. Romulus (p. 218) has "sic uerbis se deluserunt" and Wissemburg after a strange insertion "de bonis meis ipse diris"¹ goes on "verbis sermonem [apparently for *sermonum*] inuicem se luserunt," which apparently came from

ita illi uerbis deluserunt se inuicem

ADDENDUM

When the above paper was written in the early summer of 1917, I was unable to refer to the works of G. Thiele on the Mediaeval Fabulists, *Der illustrierte lateinischer Aesop in der Handschrift des Ademar* and *Der lateinische Aesop des Romulus*. This will explain why the paraphrasts are cited only by the edition of Hervieux.

The correction of *nictu* in App. 26. 9 has been made independently by L. Rank in *Mnemosyne* (1912).

THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

¹ Does this represent some corruption of "hanc vocem audio" for which there is no equivalent in the paraphrase? It is by no means the only senseless thing in the rendering which concludes with a sentence the construction and source of which are unfathomable to me. In their reproduction of "libenter inquit" as "benigne respondit," both Wissemburg and Romulus are faithful to their blundering original.